

REMARKS

The Applicant has received and reviewed the Official Action mailed by the Office on 14 July 2005 (hereinafter, the "Action"). The Applicant respectfully submits this paper as a fully responsive reply thereto, and requests reconsideration and favorable action on the subject application. Claims 1-48 are pending herein.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As stated on page 2 of the Action, claims 1-11, 15-29, 33-43, and 47-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the white paper entitled "Understanding Universal Plug and Play" (hereinafter "MS"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,636,211 to Newlin, et al. (hereinafter, "Newlin"), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,317 to Ellis, et al. (hereinafter, "Ellis"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons set forth below.

Turning first to **independent claim 1**, this claim is amended to clarify further features of the method. For convenience, independent claim 1 as amended above is reproduced here, with redlines included:

"1. (Currently Amended) A method of tuning an information presentation appliance comprising:

receiving user input specifying at least one category of information to be blocked from presentation on the appliance, wherein the category is associated with at least one user-defined keyword;

creating a device description page using a markup language;

storing data representing the categories of information specified by the user in the device description page; and

transmitting the device description page with the data representing the categories of information and the user-defined keyword through a network.”

The above revisions are believed fully supported by the originally-filed specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, at least by page 25, lines 5-10; page 26, lines 1-5; and by Table 4, which bridges pages 26 and 27. For example, Table 4 illustrates user-defined keywords such as “Mom”, “Dad”, “Mike”, and “Amy”. as being associated with the category named “Family”. As another example, Table 4 illustrates user-defined keywords such as “Sarah”, “Julie”, “Doug”, and “Sue” as being associated with the category named “Friends”.

Turning to the Action, the Applicant agrees with the assessment on Page 3 thereof that MS does not teach blocking categories of information from presentation. Accordingly, the Action cited Newlin for its teaching relating to a Parental Control limiting channel selection. Regarding MS and Newlin, however, the Applicant agrees with the assessment on Page 3 of the Action that MS and Newlin do not teach blocking of categories of information. Accordingly, the Action cited Ellis for its teaching relating to blocking categories of information from display such items in categories of Violent Content, Nudity, Language, etc.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and of the assertions made in the Action regarding the cited art, the Applicant has revised claim 1 as indicated above to recite features of the method not believed taught or suggested by the cited

art. More particularly, the Applicant submits that categories such as Violent Content, Nudity, Language, etc., for which Ellis was cited in the Action, neither teach nor suggest “user-defined keywords” associated with categories, as recited above in claim 1. In short, users do not define the categories of Violent Content, Nudity, Language, etc. Instead, these are typically pre-defined by some other party, and the user selects from among these categories. Ellis’ Figure 30 does not appear to illustrate any user-defined keywords.

On at least these bases, the Applicant submits that MS, Newlin, and Ellis do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 1, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 1.

The foregoing comments apply equally to claims 2-6, which depend from claim 1, and stand rejected on similar grounds. On at least this basis, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 2-6.

Independent claim 7 is amended to clarify features of the recited method similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. These amendments are believed supported under § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least the same basis as were the revisions to claim 1. Further, the above comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to claim 7. On at least this basis, the Applicant submits that MS, Newlin, and Ellis do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 7, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 7.

The foregoing comments apply equally to claims 8-11, which depend from claim 7, and stand rejected on similar grounds. On at least this basis, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 8-11.

Independent claim 15 is amended to clarify features of the information presentation appliance similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. These amendments are believed supported under § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least the same basis as were the revisions to claim 1. Further, the above comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to claim 15. On at least this basis, the Applicant submits that MS, Newlin, and Ellis do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 15, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 15.

These comments apply equally to claims 16-22, which depend from claim 15, and stand rejected on similar grounds. On at least this basis, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claim 16-22.

Independent claim 23 is amended to clarify features of the information presentation appliance similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. These amendments are believed supported under § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least the same basis as were the revisions to claim 1. Further, the above comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to claim 23. On at least this basis, the

Applicant submits that MS, Newlin, and Ellis do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 23, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 23.

These comments apply equally to claims 24-29, which depend from claim 23, and stand rejected on similar grounds. On at least this basis, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 24-29.

Independent claim 33 is amended to clarify features of the computer-readable medium similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. These amendments are believed supported under § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least the same basis as were the revisions to claim 1. Further, the above comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to claim 33. On at least this basis, the Applicant submits that MS, Newlin, and Ellis do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 33, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 33.

These comments apply equally to claims 34-38, which depend from claim 33, and stand rejected on similar grounds. On at least this basis, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 34-38.

Independent claim 39 is amended to clarify features of the computer-readable medium similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. These amendments are believed supported under § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least

the same basis as were the revisions to claim 1. Further, the above comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to claim 39. On at least this basis, the Applicant submits that MS, Newlin, and Ellis do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 39, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 39.

These comments apply equally to claims 40-43 and 47-48, which depend from claim 39, and stand rejected on similar grounds. On at least this basis, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 40-43 and 47-48.

Turning now to the rejections stated in Paragraph 20 on Page 13 of the Action, **dependent claims 12-14, 30-32, and 44-46** stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MS, Newlin, and Ellis, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,630 to Dubal, et al. (hereinafter "Dubal"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and addresses each of these rejections in detail below.

Claims 12-14 depend from independent claim 7, and so the comments directed above to claim 7 apply equally to claims 12-14. Likewise, claims 30-32 depend from independent claim 23, and so the comments directed above to claim 23 apply equally to claims 30-32. Finally, claims 44-46 depend from independent claim 39, and so the comments directed above to claim 39 apply equally to claims 44-46.

Regarding claims 12, 30, and 44, addressed in Paragraph 21 of the Action, the Applicant agrees that MS, Newlin, and Ellis fail to disclose using pointers to

access the service description information, so the Office cited Dubal for this teaching. However, even assuming that the cited portions of Dubal relate to obtaining pointers, Dubal does not teach or suggest the features added to each of the independent claims 7, 23, and 39, as discussed in more detail above. On at least this basis, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 12, 30, and 44.

Regarding claims 13, 31, and 45, addressed in Paragraph 22 of the Action, the Applicant agrees that MS, Newlin, and Ellis fail to disclose using pointers to a list function to access the service description information, so the Office cited Dubal for this teaching. However, even assuming that the cited portions of Dubal relate to obtaining pointers, Dubal does not teach or suggest the features added to each of the independent claims 7, 23, and 39, as discussed in more detail above. On at least this basis, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 13, 31, and 45.

Regarding claims 14, 32, and 46, addressed in Paragraph 23 of the Action, the Applicant agrees that MS, Newlin, and Ellis fail to disclose using pointers to a list function to access the service description information, so the Office cited Dubal for this teaching. However, even assuming that the cited portions of Dubal relate to obtaining pointers, Dubal does not teach or suggest the features added to each of the independent claims 7, 23, and 39, as discussed in more detail above. On at least this basis, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 14, 32, and 46.

Dependent claims 10 and 35 are amended to address informalities noted by the Applicant.

Conclusion

The Applicant requests prompt and favorable action on this application at the earliest convenience of the Office. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Date: 7 OCT 05

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 

Rocco L. Adornato
Lee & Hayes, pllc
Reg. No. 40,480
(509) 324-9256 ext. 257